	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Alex Asil Mashiri, Esq. (SBN 283798)  MASHIRI LAW FIRM A Professional Corporation 11251 Rancho Carmel Drive #500694 San Diego, CA 92150 Phone: (858) 348-4938 Fax: (858) 348-4939  Attorney for Plaintiff: ZIBA YOUSSOFI  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	11	ZIBA YOUSSOFI	Case No. <u>'15CV1764 AJB RBB</u>	
694	12	Plaintiff,		
poration L DR. # 50069. 92150 4938 4939	13	vs.	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
A Professional Corp 11251 RANCHO CARMEL SAN DIEGO, CA 9 TEL: (858) 348-4 FAX: (858) 348-4	14 15	CREDIT ONE FINANCIAL and DOES 1 through 25		
	16 17	Defendants.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
	18 19	Plaintiff ZIBA YOUSSOFI alleges as follows:	ows:	
	20	I.		
	21	INTRODUCTION		
	22	1. Plaintiff, ZIBA YOUSSOFI (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"),		
	23 24	brings this lawsuit against CREDIT ONE FINANCIAL ("Defendant") and DOES 1		
	25	through 25 (collectively referred to as "Defendants"), for violations of the Telephone		
	26	Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), and Rosenthal Fair Debt Collections Practice		
	27 28	Act ("Rosenthal FDCPA").		

## II. PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an individual, residing in the County of San Diego, State of California.
- 3. Plaintiff is a debtor as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(h) and a "person" as the term is defined under the TCPA.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant is and at all times mentioned herein was a corporation, who was conducting and engaging in business in the County of San Diego, California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant is a debt collector as defined under California law.
- 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of those Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 25, and therefore sues those Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when such names and responsibilities are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged in this complaint, and that Plaintiff's claims alleged in this complaint were proximately caused by such Defendants.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that at all times herein mentioned each of the Defendant was the agent, servant, employee, or partner of each of the remaining defendants and, in committing the acts and omissions

hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, partnership, or other business relationship, and were each responsible for the acts and omissions alleged in this complaint.

## III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violations of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012). This court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. section 1331 and 28 U.S.C. section 1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 9. This action arises out of Defendants' violations of the TCPA, and Rosenthal FDCPA. Because Defendants do business within the State of California, county of San Diego, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 10. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1391.

## IV. RELEVANT FACTS

- 11. In, or around 2015, Defendant constantly and continuously placed collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt. Plaintiff currently takes no position as to the validity of this alleged debt.
  - 12. Plaintiff's alleged debt arose through a consumer credit transaction.
- 13. Defendant placed collection calls from telephone numbers, including, but not limited to: (855)-344-7841, (855)-213-5764, (888)-338-3804, (619)-357-4318, (619)-600-5695 and (619)-632-4078.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	14.	Defendant placed collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone at
phone	e numb	per (619)-XXX-8937. On numerous occasions Defendant would hang up
witho	ut leav	ving a message identifying itself.

- Per its business practices, each of Defendant's calls were placed using an 15. automatic telephone dialing system or with an artificial or prerecorded voice.
- 16. On or about May 1, 2015 at around 9:22 a.m. Pacific Standard Time, Defendant called Plaintiff's cellular telephone and Plaintiff spoke with a female representative who identified herself as "Mida". In the course of the telephone phone call, Plaintiff requested that Defendant ceases placing collections calls to her cellular phone.
- 17. Plaintiff revoked any consent, express, or implied, to receive calls from Defendant in the course of the call on or about May 1, 2015.
- Despite Plaintiff's request for Defendant to cease calling her cellular 18. telephone, Defendant continued to place numerous collection calls (sometimes up to 10 calls per day) to Plaintiff's cellular telephone via an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined by 47 U.S.C. section 227(a)(1) or with an artificial or prerecorded voice as proscribed under 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(1)(A).
- 19. On May 19, 2015 at around 1:38 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, Defendant called Plaintiff's cellular telephone, and this time Plaintiff spoke with a male representative, who did not disclose his identity. In the course of the telephone phone

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

call, Plaintiff requested that Defendant once again cease placing collections calls to her cellular phone.

- 20. Plaintiff again, revoked any consent, express, or implied, to receive calls from Defendant in the course of the call on May 19, 2015.
- 21. Despite Plaintiff's second request for Defendant to cease calling her cellular telephone, Defendant continued to place numerous collection calls (sometimes up to 10 calls per day) to Plaintiff's cellular telephone via an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined by 47 U.S.C. section 227(a)(1) or with an artificial or prerecorded voice as proscribed under 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(1)(A).
- Upon information and believe, Defendant placed approximately 200 or 22. more telephone calls (sometimes up to 10 calls per day) to Plaintiff's cellular phone via an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined by 47 U.S.C. section 227(a)(1) or with an artificial or prerecorded voice as proscribed under 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(1)(A) after she had revoked her consent.
- 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that these telephone calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

#### V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligent Violations of the TCPA against all Defendants)

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 23, above, as if fully set forth 24. herein.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	25.	The forgoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and
multip	ole neg	ligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and
everyo	one on	e of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. section 227 et seq.

- As a result of Defendants' telephone calls, Plaintiff has suffered actual 26. damages and harm resulting from Defendants' actions as heretofore alleged, including but not limited to worry, emotional distress, anxiety, humiliation, and out-of-pocket expenses, including telephone charges, the exact amount of which is to be proven at trial.
- As a result of Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. section 227 27. et seq., Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(3)(B).
- Plaintiff is also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such 28. conduct in the future.

### VI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the TCPA against all Defendants)

- 29. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 28, above, as if fully set forth herein.
- The forgoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and 30. multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and everyone one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. section 227 et seq.

31. As a result of Defendants' telephone calls, Plaintiff has suffered actual		
damages and harm resulting from Defendants' actions as heretofore alleged, includin		
but not limited to worry, emotional distress, anxiety, humiliation, and out-of-pocket		
expenses, including telephone charges, the exact amount of which is to be proven at		
trial.		

- 32. As a result of Defendants' knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. section 227 et seq., Plaintiff is entitled to an award of up to \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. section 227(b)(3)(C).
- 33. Plaintiff is also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

# VII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of the Rosenthal FDCPA against Defendants)

- 34. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 33, above, as if fully set forth herein.
- 35. Any violation of the Federal Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a violation of California Civil Code section 1788.17, also known as the Rosenthal FDCPA. Stated differently, Civil Code section 1788.17 incorporates the FDCPA.
- 36. Defendants violated Civil Code section 1788.17 because it violated several provisions of the FDCPA. Specifically, Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. sections 1692d, and 1692d(5).

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	37.	Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. section 1692d(5) because it contacted
Plaint	iff by 1	telephone numerous times in an attempt to collect a debt. Defendant's
acts in	n callin	g Plaintiff numerous times, at one point calling Plaintiff ten (10) times on
her ce	llular 1	telephone daily to collect a debt which was intentional causing
harass	sment,	annoyance, and abuse.

- Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. section 1692d by making numerous 38. telephone calls to Plaintiff, engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which Defendant was harassing, oppressing, and abusing Plaintiff.
- 39. Defendants also violated the Rosenthal FDCPA by violating California Civil Code section 1788.11(e). Defendants violated section 1788.11(e) by communicating with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable and to constitute a harassment.
- Defendants also violated the Rosenthal FDCPA by violating California 40. Civil Code section 1788.11(d) because it contacted Plaintiff by telephone numerous times in an attempt to collect a debt. Defendants' communication was repeatedly and/or continuously to annoy Plaintiff.
- As a result of each and every violation of the Rosenthal FDCPA, 41. Plaintiff has suffered actual damages and harm resulting from Defendants' actions as heretofore alleged, including but not limited to worry, emotional distress, anxiety, humiliation, and out-of-pocket expenses including but not limited to gasoline

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

expenses, postage expenses, and telephone charges, the exact amount of which is to be proven at trial.

As a result of each and every violation of the Rosenthal FDCPA, 42. Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code section 1788.30(a); statutory damages under 1692k(a)(2)(A) which is incorporated by California Civil Code section 1788.17; statutory damages for a knowing or willful violation in the amount of up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to California Civil Code section 1788.30(b); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Civil Code section 1788.30(c).

#### VIII. PRAYER FOR DAMAGES AND OTHER REMEDIES

- For actual damages; 1.
- 2. For statutory damages;
- 3. For interest according to law;
- For attorneys' fees under the Rosenthal FDCPA; 4.
- For costs of suit herein incurred; and 5.
- For other and further relief as the court may deem proper. 6.

DATED: August 10, 2015 **MASHIRI LAW FIRM** A Professional Corporation

> By: /s/Alex Asil Mashiri Alex Asil Mashiri Attorney for Plaintiff, ZIBA YOUSSOFI